

Appl. No. 10/608,913
Filed: June 26, 2003
Amdt. Dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2004

REMARKS

By this paper, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, 28, 34, and 35, and has canceled Claim 32. Upon entry of the amendment, Claims 1-31 and 33-42 would be pending and are presented for further examination.

The Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's gesture in taking the time to discuss the pending rejection of the claims during an interview with Applicant's representative, Mark Abumeri, on July 19, 2004. As agreed during the interview, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, 28, 34 and 35 to more particularly point out certain features of the invention. More particularly, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 25, and 35 to specifically recite that only the distorted light is converged or diverged. Moreover, the Applicant has amended Claims 28 and 34 to specifically recite that a pixel offset distance from a desired location is determined.

As discussed during the interview, the Examiner agreed that said amendments should overcome the present rejection of all claims rejected based on U.S. Patent No. 6,151,103 to Shu. The Applicant submits that Shu fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of independent Claims 1, 25, 28, 34, and 35, as amended. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that those claims be allowed.

Claims 2-24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33 and 36-42 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 25, 28 and 35, and further define additional patentable features. In view of patentability of the independent claims, and in further view of the additional technical features, Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 2-24, 26, 27, 29-31, 33 and 36-42 are also patentable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefor, and arguments in support of patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are made in order to improve the clarity of claim language, to correct grammatical mistakes or ambiguities, and to otherwise improve the clarity of the claims to particularly and distinctly point out the invention to those of skill in the art. Finally, Applicant submits that the claim limitations above represent only

Appl. No. 10/608,913
Filed: June 26, 2003
Amdt. Dated July 22, 2004
Reply to Office action of June 10, 2004

illustrative distinctions. Hence, there may be other patentable features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and, particularly, that all claims be allowed. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: July 22, 2004

By: 

Mark M. Abumeri
Registration No. 43,458
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\MMA\MMA-8487.DOC
072004